



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY

BRONXVILLE, NEW YORK.

SIR,—In the December number of the REVIEW is an article, "Must Protestantism Adopt Christian Science?" by "A Churchman," and may I respectfully ask the writer, or any other Christian Scientist, first, What is Christian Science? Further: What are its aims and objects? In what does it differ from Christ's teachings—commonly, generally, popularly known as Christianity? Is it an improvement of or on Christianity? If so, in what respect or respects? If Christianity and Christian Science are the same, why was the original name Christianity changed to Christian Science?

If Christianity is not all-sufficient and all-comprehensive for the guidance and salvation of humanity, in what respect is it deficient?

From my reading of Mrs. Eddy's book, *Science and Health*, I deduce that Christian Science, *per se*, is neither Christian nor scientific.

Science and Health doesn't confine itself to Christian Science. If it did it would be of no use to humanity. The parts of the book that are applicable, here and now, belong to *Mental Science*, and are not original with Mrs. Eddy at all. *Mental Science*, in its last analysis, is nothing more or less than *applied Christianity*.

Mrs. Eddy gave the world nothing new when she wrote *Mental Science* into her book, nor did she give humanity anything useful when she wrote the part of it that is not *Mental Science*.

A tramp once made use of a wonderful "soupstone" which, when boiled with the right quantities of water, vegetables, meat, salt, etc., produced a very good soup. Similarly, Christian Science possesses virtues—when used in combination with the right quantities of *Mental Science*.

Some there were who couldn't understand the real value of the soupstone; and some there are who do not understand the real value of *Christian Science*.

On page 7, of *Science and Health*, we find this assertion: "God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter."

The real worth of any school, science, law, religion, or ism lies in its capability of application. And so, if all were God, Spirit, where and how could Christian Science, or any other Science, be *applied*?

The Rev. Lyman Abbott says that "the best proof of belief is conduct," and that "we all act as if there were both mind and matter."

Mrs. Eddy was not an exception to this rule. It applies to every Christian Scientist. *It applies to the whole of humanity*. Even Christ, while incarnate, didn't attempt to live the wholly spiritual life. He ate material food, wore material clothes, wept material tears, and suffered through the material body, on the cross.

On page 104, of *Science and Health*, we find: "You embrace your body in your thought, and you should delineate upon it thoughts of health." Here, you see, is where we catch the Christian Scientist over in the *Mental Science* field, dealing with the body—matter—after asserting that "God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter." And there is where you find him every time he gives a "treatment." In theory he may be a Christian Scientist, but when he comes to practise he is necessarily a *Mental Scientist*, owing to the very pertinent fact that "God, Spirit" stands in no need of human "treatment."

On page 80, Mrs. Eddy said, speaking of evil, "It is nothing because it is the absence of something."

Did you ever stop to think about what *nothing* means—what it implies? Bergson says, "There is more, and not less, in the idea of an object conceived of as *not* existing than in the idea of this same object conceived of as *existing*, for the idea of the object not existing is necessarily the idea of the object *existing* with, in addition, the representation of an exclusion of the object."

Both Christians and Scientists are agreed to-day that even "thoughts are things."

And yet—"evil is nothing"!

On page 173, *Science and Health*, we find: "Matter is an error of statement." On the same page, this: "The opposite of Spirit is matter." And on the next page (174), this: "Spirit is God and God is all, hence He can have no opposite." Verily, here is logical consistency! And yet, we have only to follow Mrs. Eddy to page 249, where, with her "key," she clears up the whole tangle by informing us that (Christian) "Science is co-ordinate neither with the premises nor conclusions of human belief."

We find, then, that Mrs. Eddy must have been superhuman. That her "Science" is neither comprehensible nor applicable to humanity at its present stage of development. That it *may* apply, *some time*, here on earth, should man ever become, here, more than man; or that it may apply to some future state of Life which he may attain in some other world. But, that Christian Scientists have not made, and do not and *cannot*, now, make use of Christian Science. That they have so far used, do now use, and can now *only use* Mental Science.

And so the question remains, What is Christian Science?

In answer to the question, "Must Protestantism Adopt Christian Science?" I say, even though it would, it *cannot*. If Protestantism would fulfil its mission, it must, however, adopt *Christianity*.

A STUDENT.

A FORUM FOR ALL

BALTIMORE, MD.

SIR,—From time to time articles appear in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW that surely cannot appeal to the sense of propriety of its editor. Its pages sometimes seem to be open to the faddist, the visionary, the up-lifter, and, I am almost tempted to say, the charlatan. The contributions in the December monthly on the "Washington Segregation" and on "Christian Science" are examples of loose thinking, erroneous statements, and wrong and dangerous conclusions.

Presuming that there must be some good reason for this policy, I write to ask if you will not briefly enlighten me, with the assurance that your reply will be for my information only, and will not be used in any other way.

Also permit me to add that there are thousands of readers of the REVIEW who are very apt to believe everything you print, and many of your readers feel like protesting against this policy as being harmful to the whole country.

C. S. A.

[The policy of this REVIEW is indicated by its motto: "*Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.*"—EDITOR.]